

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 were presented and examined. Claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 1-15 are rejected and Claims 6 and 9 are objected to. In response to the Office Action, Claims 1, 9, 10 and 15 are amended and Claim 6 is cancelled. No claims are added. Claims 1-5 and 7-15 remain in the application. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

### **I. Objection to the Specification**

The title has been objected to because the title contains grammatical errors. Applicants have amended the title. Withdrawal of the objection to the Specification is respectfully requested.

### **II. Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 6 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **III. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 7, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,974,444 issued to Konrad (“Konrad”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,402,418 issued to Shibata (“Shibata”), U.S. Patent No. 6,275,213 issued to Tremblay (“Tremblay”), U.S. Patent No. 5,963,302 issued to Wittek (“Wittek”), U.S. Patent No. 5,341,229 issued to Rowan (“Rowan”), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0162595 of Serbanescu (“Serbanescu”) and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0150123 of Ro (“Ro”).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Konrad, Shibata, Tremblay, Wittek, Rowan, Serbanescu, and Ro, as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0054608 of Wan (“Wan”).

Claims 2-4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Konrad, Shibata, Tremblay, Wittek, Rowan, Serbanescu, and Ro, as applied to Claims 1 and 7, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0036868 of Roy (“Roy”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,007,338 issued to DiNunzio (“DiNunzio”).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Konrad, Shibata, Tremblay, Wittek, Rowan, Serbanescu, and Ro, as applied to Claim 10, and further in view of U.S. Patent No5,907,366 issued to (“Farmer”).

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Konrad, Shibata, Tremblay, Wittek, Rowan, Serbanescu, and Ro, as applied to Claim 10, and further in view of Roy.

In response to the Action, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 7, 10 and 15.

Regarding the rejections of the Claims 1, 7, 10 and 15 under 35 U.S.C §103 as being unpatentable over Konrad, and further in view of Shibata, Tremblay, Wittek, Rowan, Serbanescu and Ro, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 10 and 15 to include the limitations of cancelled Claim 6, which the Examiner indicated is allowable over the prior art. Although the amendments differ slightly from the language from Claim 6, Applicant submits that the patentably distinct elements of Claim 6 as noted above are included in the amended claims.

As noted by the Examiner, Konrad does not teach synchronizing video/audio packets with touch/odor/taste packets. The Examiner relies upon Serbanescu to provide the synchronization teaching. Although Serbanescu does not teach packet synchronization, the Examiner cites Ro who teaches audio and video packet synchronization. The Examiner relies on Shibata for its teaching of a multiplexing means. Claim 1 calls for multiplexing the video/audio packets with the touch, odor and taste packets. Shibata does not teach or suggest touch, odor or taste packets or multiplexing of such packets. Without a teaching in the prior art of multiplexing touch, odor and taste packets with audio/video packets, the prior art does not contain the necessary teachings to render Claim 1 obvious.

### CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207 3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: February 1, 2010

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(310) 207-3800

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted  
electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marilyn Bass

February 1, 2010